

Standard 602

1. As a newer director I haven't felt qualified to express an opinion on 601 and 602, I suppose for appearing ignorant of a burning issue. They seem fine to me. Are there issues that are coming up with them that you would like addressed by people's thoughts or are these not the critical issues?
2. I might take out the language about the law library being administered by the university general library system.
3. As a newer director I haven't felt qualified to express an opinion on 601 and 602, I suppose for appearing ignorant of a burning issue. They seem fine to me. Are there issues that are coming up with them that you would like addressed by people's thoughts or are these not the critical issues?
4. I think that since the director of the law library's status/relationship with the faculty is going through many changes, that the first sentence of the interpretation should specifically include the "law library director" as a discreet individual and not be lumped as part of the faculty. The sentence should then read: "This Standard recognizes that substantial operating autonomy rests with the dean, the director of the law library, and the faculty of a law school with regard to the operation of the law school library."
5. Since the language in this standard and interpretation is flexible enough to encompass differing administrative arrangements without sacrificing the central role of the law school, I'm not sure that any change is needed (although I've added a few thoughts). I'm looking forward to seeing what our colleagues have to say.
6. Seems inconsistent with AALS which requires FACULTY involvement with plans for the development of the library. If so, make them conform.
7. I cannot imagine why any law school or law library would want to change this language--these provisions are clear and provide important protections to law school and law faculty oversight of the law library. I would like to work on the interpretation! The biggest danger of being administered within a larger library system is an inadequate budget and a limited view of service levels, particularly for the faculty, so it would be good if the acceptability of the law library remaining in the larger system were tied to the adequacy of funding.
8. It may not be possible in certain university environments for the budget to be determined in the same way. E.g., at UNC money to libraries comes to the University System. It parcels it to the campus. The campus divides it into Academic Affairs and Health Affairs. Law is part of Academic Affairs but only for budget -- so the University Librarian and I work together to divide the new money.

The UL doesn't supervise the law library at all or have any budget control. Luckily, this works for us very well, but it also means that the dean doesn't have much to do with my budget. Am I lucky or what? So, the wording really doesn't anticipate this sort of arrangement, but the

university is unlikely to change it. So, I would suggest adding something to this effect: "If the budgetary determination is done in another manner, it must give sufficient autonomy to the library director." Or something to that effect....

9. Seems inconsistent with AALS which requires FACULTY involvement with plans for the development of the library. If so, make them conform.
10. I think that the library director should be solely responsible in consultation with the Dean. The Dean should not be selecting personnel or making collection development and maintenance decisions. The library budget should not be administered in the same manner as the law school budget. The library budget should be administered by the library director alone. The law school budget should be administered by the law school Dean.
11. The current wording sounds like the faculty should have a part in the development of library policy. Maybe it is a broad statement on purpose. Some schools have a faculty library committee and that might be a good suggestion.
12. I marked this a no change since the language in 602(a) supports the goal expressed in 601(a) and it is in the interest of all law schools to have this particular standard. The focus on law school, rather than law library, autonomy is probably well-placed given the number of universities in which the law library is a division of the university library. Reading this language, however, with only the first part of the interpretation as guidance, could lead one to the conclusion that there is nothing to support the preference for law library autonomy expressed in the last sentence of the interpretation. On the other hand, since there seems to be a general understanding in legal education that this Standard calls for sufficient autonomy of the law library (presumably, the law school already has administrative autonomy) so that the law school can direct it in support of the school's mission, I'm inclined to leave well-enough alone and not change the language.

The next three subsections all support 602(a) and should be retained unchanged.

I'm not sure that the language of 602 sufficiently supports the conclusion in sentence 3 of the interpretation: "This envisions law library participation in university library decisions..." The question, of course, is whether this is worth doing anything about (I have not faced the problem of non-consultation on significant issues on the part of the university library, but maybe I've been lucky)? While it might be a good idea to have a sentence in 602(a) which embodies the sense of sentences 2 and 3 of the interpretation, the trick would be to draft one which did not appear to be encroaching on the autonomy of other libraries, or that would raise the question of autonomy of the law library. Perhaps something along the following lines would work: "The law library shall be an active participant in decisions of other libraries of the university which will materially affect it"

13. As a newer director I haven't felt qualified to express an opinion on 601 and 602, I suppose for appearing ignorant of a burning issue. They seem fine to me. Are there issues that are coming up with them that would like addressed by people's thoughts or are these not the critical issues?